A theoretical study of CO adsorption on FeCo(100) and the effect of alloying
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**Abstract**

FeCo catalysts are modeled for optimizing the Fischer–Tropsch synthesis process since they can be tuned to enhance CO activity and resist poisoning. The electronic properties associated with CO adsorption are studied using plane-wave density functional theory (DFT). The range of computed adsorption energies from this work falls between the CO adsorption energies on pure Fe and Co surfaces. It was found that CO prefers to adsorb on the top site of the Co surface of FeCo alloys, whereas CO has stronger adsorption on pure Fe rather than pure Co surface. The trend in adsorption energy is top-Co > hollow-Fe > top-Fe > hollow-Co > bridge-Co > bridge-Fe. This change in preferable metal for adsorption (i.e., from Fe in a pure system to Co in the FeCo alloy surface in the current investigation) is due to the shift in the d-band center of the alloyed material. It implies that alloying Fe with Co changes the properties of the pure metal and ultimately affects the CO adsorption energy; however, the mechanism of adsorption remains similar and can be explained using the Nilsson–Pettersson model. Additional CO configurations consisting of hollow-site adsorption with a tilted geometry, was also investigated. The corresponding adsorption energy was found to be slightly higher than the adsorption energy when CO is adsorbed on the top-Co site.

© 2011 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

**1. Introduction**

Fischer–Tropsch (FT) synthesis, a key process in transforming coal or biomass feedstocks into liquid fuels, is a catalyzed chemical reaction converting synthesis gas (CO + H₂), which is obtained from gasification, into various forms of liquid hydrocarbons. The current commercial FT catalysts are either cobalt (Co)-based or iron (Fe)-based catalysts. The Co-based catalysts are more active and have a longer lifetime than Fe-based. Additionally the Co-based catalysts have selectivity towards linear paraffins, while Fe-based are selective toward high-valued linear alkenes [1,2]. Due to the low H₂:CO ratio in coal-derived synthesis gas, water–gas shift (WGS) activity is a crucial step in enhancing H₂ production and leads to an increase in the H₂:CO ratio in FT synthesis. Generally, catalysts based on Fe are preferred for FT synthesis with coal-derived synthesis gas since they exhibit higher WGS reactivity. However, they are susceptible to primarily two contaminants in the synthesis gas, that is, sulfur that naturally exists in coal and biomass, and carbon which forms a carbide layer over the catalyst surface [1,2]. By considering the benefits and limitations of both catalysts, an alloy of Fe and Co is an attractive option for incorporating the individual advantages as well as suppressing their existing drawbacks.

Several experimental studies have been carried out on bimetallic FeCo alloys and the effect of relative composition on the FT reaction [3-6]. These materials have shown high activity towards FT synthesis and demonstrated promise for suppressing carbide formation thereby slowing the catalyst degradation rate [3]. However, none of these studies have provided information regarding a mechanism associated with the influences of the bimetallic properties on the specific adsorption, dissociation, and formation pathways of the FT reaction mechanism on FeCo alloys surfaces. Recently, theoretical investigations on the adsorption and dissociation of CO and H₂ on the FeCo alloy (110) surface have been conducted [7,8]. It has been shown that CO adsorption is favored at Co sites rather than Fe in the case of FeCo alloys. In contrast, other theoretical studies of CO adsorption on pure Fe(110) [9] and pure Co(0001) [10] surfaces reveal that the pure Fe surface appears to have stronger CO binding energies compared to the pure Co surface. It was concluded that the synergetic effect of the bimetallic FeCo bulk alters its physical and chemical properties compared to the pure surfaces of Fe or Co. In addition, the interaction between the neighboring Fe and Co atoms affects the local electronic structures of the different active sites on the surface and the bond strength of the adsorbed CO. Nevertheless, a fundamental understanding of the molecular-level interactions of neighboring Fe and Co atoms is still lacking and information related to CO adsorption on a variety of FeCo alloy surfaces remains scarce.

Within this work, CO adsorption on the FeCo(100) surface has been investigated and compared to the previous study of CO adsorption on the FeCo(110) surface [8]. Since true catalysts are often a combination of various surfaces due to reconfiguration upon support deposition, it is not necessarily the case that the most stable single-crystal surface is the most reactive in application. It is well...
known that defects such as stepped, corrugated or kink sites are likely more reactive compared to their low-index counterparts [11–17]. In the current study, the less stable surface, i.e., FeCo(100) has been investigated. The analysis of the local density of states (LDOS) and charge density profile of the CO-adsorbed systems has been applied to examine the CO adsorption mechanism on the FeCo(100) surface, which is the first step in the FT synthesis process.

2. Computational methodology

All calculations are based upon plane-wave density functional theory (DFT) and performed using the Vienna ab initio simulation package [18–20]. The electron–ion interactions are represented by the projector-augmented wave (PAW) approach [21,22] and the exchange-correlation effects are described by the Perdew-Wang 91 (PW91) [23,24] generalized gradient approximation (GGA). The kinetic energy cutoff for the plane-wave basis set is set at 400 eV. Spin polarization is taken into account in all calculations due to the occupied by Fe atoms whereas the neighboring sublayer is enriched in Co atoms when the surface is exposed to a vacuum environment. It was discussed previously that the FeCo(110) is the most stable surface where the FeCo(100) surface is the next most stable [7]; however, it was not explicitly outlined which surface termination was included in the calculation of the FeCo(100) surface.

A supercell using a 4-layer slab model in a 2 × 2 arrangement with four metal atoms per layer was modeled for the subsequent calculation regarding the adsorption study of CO on the FeCo(100) surface. A 10-Å vacuum region was placed above the slab surface to avoid dipole interactions from periodic images. The bottom two layers were fixed at their bulk positions while the remaining top two layers in addition to the CO molecule were allowed to relax to their optimized geometries. The adsorption of CO is assumed to occur on only one side of the slab with the CO molecule adsorbed with the carbon atom of CO directed downward toward the FeCo surface. Fig. 1 shows the schematic representation of the possible adsorption sites of CO on the FeCo(100) surface with 0.25 ML and 0.50 ML coverages. Fe and Co atoms are shown by gold and blue circles, respectively. The dashed box represents the unit cell of the FeCo(100) surface viewed from the top. Each layer of a unit cell consists of four metal atoms. One CO molecule and two CO molecules adsorbed on the surface depicts 0.25 ML and 0.50 ML coverage, respectively. There are three possible adsorption locations, that is, top, bridge and hollow site.

The additional calculation for the surface energy of FeCo(110), which has a mixture of Fe and Co atoms at the surface yields a surface energy of 2.161 J/m². The order of surface energies from lowest to greatest, i.e., FeCo(100)–Fe< FeCo(110)–Fe< FeCo(100)–Co, indicates that the FeCo(100)–Fe surface is most likely to exist upon cleavage of the Fe-Co alloy. This result may seem counterintuitive since the (110) surface is normally the most stable compared to other bcc surfaces; however, these surface energies are in reasonable agreement with previous spectroscopy data on the FeCo alloy. According to the surface composition of a bulk 50 Fe/50 Co by Auger electron spectroscopy [33], the surface composition was found to be 75 ± 5 at.% Fe and 25 ± 5 at.% Co suggesting that the surface is enriched with Fe. Therefore, it can be implied that the surface layer in the (100) orientation will be occupied by Fe atoms whereas the neighboring sublayer is enriched in Co atoms when the surface is exposed to a vacuum environment. It was discussed previously that the FeCo(110) is the most stable surface where the FeCo(100) surface is the next most stable [7]; however, it was not explicitly outlined which surface termination was included in the calculation of the FeCo(100) surface.

A supercell using a 4-layer slab model in a 2 × 2 arrangement with four metal atoms per layer was modeled for the subsequent calculation regarding the adsorption study of CO on the FeCo(100) surface. A 10-Å vacuum region was placed above the slab surface to avoid dipole interactions from periodic images. The bottom two layers were fixed at their bulk positions while the remaining top two layers in addition to the CO molecule were allowed to relax to their optimized geometries. The adsorption of CO is assumed to occur on only one side of the slab with the CO molecule adsorbed with the carbon atom of CO directed downward toward the FeCo surface. Fig. 1 shows the schematic representation of the possible adsorption sites of CO on the FeCo(100) surface with 0.25 ML and 0.50 ML coverages. Fe and Co atoms are shown by gold and blue circles, respectively. The dashed box represents the unit cell of the FeCo(100) surface viewed from the top. Each layer of a unit cell consists of four metal atoms. One CO molecule and two CO molecules adsorbed on the surface depicts 0.25 ML and 0.50 ML coverage, respectively. There are three possible adsorption locations, that is, top, bridge and hollow site. In addition, the two configurations for the 0.50 ML CO adsorption on the FeCo(100) surface are zigzag and straight configuration as shown in Fig. 1(b) and (c).

\[
\sigma = \frac{1}{A} \left( E^{\text{rel}} + E^{\text{tot}} \right)
\]

\[
\text{where } E^{\text{rel}} = \frac{1}{2} \left( E_s - N_{\text{at}} E_B \right)
\]

A 7 × 7 × 1 k-point grid has been used to reduce the computational time while maintaining the accuracy of the results. It has been verified that the same lattice constant is obtained using the finer k-point grid, 11 × 11 × 11. The calculated surface energies of the FeCo(100)–Co and FeCo(100)–Fe surfaces are 3.029 J/m² and 2.042 J/m², respectively.
3. Results and discussion

3.1. Adsorption energy

The calculated adsorption energies as well as the corresponding geometry of CO on the FeCo(100) surface at various adsorption sites for the case of 0.25 ML coverage are listed in Table 1. Before discussing the CO adsorption energies on alloys, it is interesting to examine adsorption on the pure metals Fe and Co. The CO adsorption energy on the pure Fe(001) surface is 1.62 eV [34], whereas the CO adsorption energy on the pure Co(0001) surface is 1.16 eV [35]. Apparently, CO binds stronger on the pure Fe surface than the pure Co surface; however, this trend is opposite in case of the FeCo alloy as seen from Table 1, where the CO molecule prefers to bind with Co rather than with Fe on the FeCo(100) surface. This evidence confirms that alloying Fe and Co modifies the metal properties of the pure state to some extent.

To compare the trend of CO adsorption on different FeCo surfaces, adsorption energies on the FeCo(110) surfaces are also included in Table 1. Since the FeCo(110) surface naturally consists of a mixture of Fe and Co atoms in each layer, the existing adsorption sites for CO are different and only the CO adsorption energies on top-Co and top-Fe sites of the FeCo(110) surface are considered for comparison with the adsorption energies on the FeCo(100) surface. In case of the CO adsorption on the FeCo(110) surface, it was found that the top-Co site is the most energetically favorable with the Co-C bond formation preferred [8]. This is also found in the case of CO adsorption on the FeCo(100) surface where CO adsorption at the top-Co site is the most stable configuration due to its highest adsorption energy. However, this adsorption energy is found to be weaker than that of the top-Co site on the FeCo(110) surface. On the other hand, the Co adsorption energy on the top-Fe site of the FeCo(100) surface is stronger than that of the top-Fe site of the FeCo(110) surface. It is important to keep in mind that the surface of FeCo(100) is composed of the same atom type (alternating atom type per layer), whereas the FeCo(110) surface has a mixture of Fe and Co atoms. The difference in surface composition between the FeCo(100) and FeCo(110) surfaces can lead to the modification of the electronic structure of the surface atoms. The degree of modification may depend on the type of the neighboring atom, which can be different between each surface. In the case of the FeCo(110) surface, this mixture of Fe and Co atoms can alter the property of surface Co atoms such that there is an increase in local electron density in this area compared to that of the Co atoms within the FeCo(100)–Co surface, in which Co is surrounded by only Co atoms in the x and y directions. On the Pauling electronegativity scale, Co (1.880) has a slightly higher electronegativity than Fe (1.830), which is consistent with Co withdrawing electron density from nearest neighbor Fe atoms in a mixed layer, as is the case of the FeCo(110) surface. This in part explains why the adsorption energy on the top-Co site of the FeCo(110) surface is stronger than the adsorption on the top-Co site of the FeCo(100) surface. Within the CO molecule, carbon is acting as a Lewis acid and interacting strongly with the metal that exhibits the most basic character, i.e., the propensity to donate electron density. Consistent with this reasoning, the local electron density of the surface Fe atom of the FeCo(110) surface decreases compared to the surface Fe of the FeCo(100)–Fe surface. As a result, the opposite trend is observed, i.e., CO adsorbs weaker at the top-Fe site of the FeCo(110) surface than at the top-Fe site of the FeCo(100)–Fe surface. In addition, the surface properties such as the work function and d-band center will be different thereby contributing to the observed variation in CO adsorption on a particular surface.

Consider the adsorption energy of CO at higher coverage, that is, 0.50 ML as tabulated in Table 2 and recall that there are two possible CO adsorption configurations as described previously. Similar to the result of 0.25 ML CO coverage, the most preferable adsorption site is the top site with the zigzag adsorption configuration yielding the more stable configuration for CO adsorption, which is likely a result of the symmetry of the structure of the adsorbed molecule on the surface. Moreover, the CO molecule remains preferentially adsorbed on Co rather than Fe.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adsorption site</th>
<th>r(C–O) (Å)</th>
<th>r(C-metal) (Å)</th>
<th>h(C-metal) (Å)</th>
<th>Adsorption energy (eV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FeCo(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top-Co</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>1.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top-Fe</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>1.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridge-Co</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>1.914 [2]</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td>1.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridge-Fe</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>1.943 [2]</td>
<td>1.492</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollow-Co</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>2.124 [4]</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>1.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollow-Fe</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>2.111 [4]</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>1.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeCo(110) [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top-Co</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>1.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top-Fe</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>1.816</td>
<td>1.816</td>
<td>1.491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adsorption site</th>
<th>r(C–O) (Å)</th>
<th>r(C-metal) (Å)</th>
<th>h(C-metal) (Å)</th>
<th>Adsorption energy (eV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>top-Co, zigzag</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>1.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top-Co, straight</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>1.780</td>
<td>1.780</td>
<td>1.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top-Fe, zigzag</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>1.801</td>
<td>1.801</td>
<td>1.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top-Fe, straight</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>1.798</td>
<td>1.798</td>
<td>1.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridge-Co, zigzag</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>1.918 [2]</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>1.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridge-Fe, zigzag</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>1.953 [2]</td>
<td>1.504</td>
<td>1.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bridge-Fe, straight</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>1.977 [2]</td>
<td>1.464</td>
<td>1.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollow-Co, zigzag</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>2.132 [4]</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>1.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollow-Fe, straight</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>2.124 [4]</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>1.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollow-Fe, zigzag</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>2.135 [4]</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>1.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollow-Fe, straight</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>2.137 [4]</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>1.318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> The bond distance between C atom and the nearest-neighbor metal atom. The number in the bracket represents the metal coordination atom.

<sup>b</sup> The distance between C atom and the top metal layer.
Electronic structure and mechanism of CO adsorption on the FeCo(100) alloy

Charge density profiles for the CO-adsorbed systems for top-, bridge- and hollow-Co sites with 0.25 ML coverage are shown in Fig. 2. The bond-breaking between the C and O atoms is clearly seen as well as the bond formation between the C atom and associated metal atoms. In addition, the charge accumulation of the O atom is observed and corresponds to a lone electron pair from the breaking of the internal C–O bond.

Further explanation concerning the adsorption mechanism as well as the site preference for CO adsorption on the FeCo alloy surface can be extracted from the local density of states (LDOS) plots corresponding to CO adsorbed at various adsorption locations. Fig. 3(a) shows the LDOS plots of the CO free-gas molecule, where each individual peak represents the interacting molecular orbitals of the CO molecule. These orbitals are termed $\pi$1, $\pi$2, $\sigma$5 and $\sigma$7 and are located at approximately $-5$, $-3$, $0$ and $7$ eV, respectively. The $5\sigma$ orbital is known as the highest occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) of the CO free-gas molecule since it resides exactly at the fermi level (0 eV), while the $2\pi$ orbital is the lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO). Fig. 3(b) and (c) illustrate the LDOS plots of the clean FeCo(100)–Co and FeCo(100)–Fe surfaces, respectively. Fig. 4 illustrates the LDOS plots of CO-adsorbed surfaces of the FeCo(100) surface at top sites with 0.25 ML coverage. The interactions between the adsorbed CO molecule and each surface occur at two distinct locations with electronic energies of approximately $-9$ eV ($4\sigma$) and $-6$ eV ($5\sigma$ and $1\pi$). At the $5\sigma$ peak, a significant change regarding the degree of polarization of the CO molecule can be noticed. In spite of having the $5\sigma$ orbital polarizing towards the C atom as it is prior to adsorption, it instead polarizes towards the O atom after adsorption. The intensity weakening associated with the $\pi$-band tailing off to the Fermi level is also observed in all cases. The additional state at $-4$ eV with low intensity is found in the $\sigma$-system after adsorption. This state represents the antibonding orbital between the CO molecule and metal. Considering the adsorption on the FeCo(100)–Co surface, the Co atoms appear to play a more important role than the Fe atoms as can be seen from the relative peak intensity of Fe and Co $d$ orbitals. This observation is opposite when CO adsorbs on the top-Fe site in which the peak intensity of Fe $d$ orbital is higher.

The CO adsorption on transition metals is commonly described by the traditional Blyholder model [36] where two valence states, that is, the filled $5\sigma$ and the empty $2\pi^*$ states play an important role in coupling to the metal $d$-states. Charge donation from the $5\sigma$ orbital to the metal $d$-states is balanced by a back-donation into the molecular $2\pi^*$ which results in a weakening of the internal CO molecular bond. However, it has been found that the coupling of the $2\pi^*$ orbital to the metal $d$-bands is much stronger than the coupling of the $5\sigma$ orbital for CO adsorption on the late transition metals [37]. The Blyholder model has been recently modified by describing the role of the $\sigma$- and $\pi$-contribution and named as the Nilsson–Pettersson model [38]. The $\sigma$-donation and the $\pi$-interaction are responsible for the repulsion and the attraction, respectively. The electronic configuration of the CO-adsorbed system is arranged towards minimizing the $\sigma$-repulsion.
while maximizing the π-bonding. The π-system takes into account the rehybridization of the 1π and 2π* orbitals which breaks the internal π-bond. One part of the electron pair becomes a lone-pair orbital on the O atom and the other part creates a radical state for the C atom, which is free for bonding as can be seen from Fig. 2. As seen in Fig. 4, the weak intensity of the π-band at about −2 eV, which is tailing off to the Fermi level, represents a lone-pair orbital on the O atom. The LDOS plots for the 0.25 ML CO-adsorbed system at the bridge and hollow sites are attached as supplementary illustrations. The same observation as that of CO adsorption on top sites can be drawn as the tailing π-band is clearly apparent. In addition, the metal d-states at approximately −9 eV and −10 eV are found in the case of CO adsorption at the higher coordination sites. This small extra peak is overlapping with the 4σ-state of the adsorbed CO molecule, which refers to the interaction between the CO molecule and the neighboring metal atoms. However, it appears that the 2π* orbital becomes more involved in the π-interaction when CO adsorbs on the higher coordination site such as the hollow site. Generally, the degree of π-interaction increases with increasing metal coordination [38,39]. It has been known that DFT may not provide an accurate description of the HOMO–LUMO gap for the CO gas-phase molecule [40]. An overestimation of the interaction between the 2π* orbital and the metal d-electrons for the high coordination site may be as a result of the underestimate of the HOMO–LUMO gap for CO where the underestimated HOMO position is predicted [35]. As a result, an inconsistency of the C-metal bond formation preference at the hollow site occurs when the hollow-Fe site is more favorable than the hollow-Co site at 0.25 ML coverage; meanwhile, the opposite observation is found at 0.50 ML coverage. This issue may be resolved by applying a molecular DFT+U approach so that the HOMO–LUMO gap for CO and the strength of chemisorption can be corrected for high coordination metal sites [40] or by performing the random phase approximation (RPA) calculation where the right decay behavior outside the metal surface can be achieved by combining the exact exchange from the Hartree–Fock (HF) expression with the correlation energy based on the renormalized Coulomb potential [41]. This method can be used as the post-correction to the preceding standard DFT calculation since it has been shown to improve the adsorption energy and the site preference of CO on metallic surfaces [42].

Consider the electronic structure of the CO adsorption at higher coverages. The LDOS plots of 0.50 ML CO coverage for the possible configurations can be found in the supplementary illustrations. It is obvious that the characteristics of these LDOS plots are more complicated than the cases for the 0.25 ML CO coverage. However, the basic observation, that is, the polarization towards the O atom of the 5σ orbital and the π-band tailing towards the Fermi level is observed.

3.3. Effect of alloying on pure metal properties

Alloying Fe and Co does not change the mechanism of CO adsorption on their corresponding pure metal surfaces; however, the electronic properties of the alloy can be altered from the original properties of the pure metal surface and affect the adsorption energy as discussed previously. When CO adsors on the alloy of Fe and Co, it prefers to bind to the Co-site. Meanwhile, the opposite trend is exhibited if CO adsors on a pure Fe and Co surface. In this section, two important properties – work function (Φ) and the d-band center of metal (ε_d) – are discussed in detail. The shift in the work function affects the reactivity of a transition metal surface, more specifically, the bonding between the CO molecule and the metal surface can be strengthened or weakened by changing the location of the d-band center of the metal.

3.3.1. Work function (Φ)

The work function is defined as the minimum energy that is required to remove an electron from the highest occupied energy level in the solid to the vacuum. It can be calculated from the difference between the potential in the vacuum region and the Fermi level. The work function of the pure Co(0001) and Fe(001) surfaces as well as the calculated work function of the FeCo(001) surface are listed in Table 3. Notice that the work function of the alloy is lower than the value of the pure materials. It can be inferred from this difference that less energy is required to remove an electron from the
alloy surface implying that the surface sites may be more likely to exhibit a basic nature, which is preferred for a strong interaction with the acidic carbon atom of CO. It is well-known that the difference in the range of energy in the band structure and the Fermi level is responsible for the difference in work function for different metals [43]. Therefore, it can be expected that the energy in the band structure as well as the Fermi level of the FeCo(100) surface are modified after alloying Fe and Co.

The CO molecule is considered to be an electronegative adsorbate when it interacts with the carbon atom directed downward towards metal surface. The molecule withdraws the electron density from the metal implying that a material with a lower work function is more favorable for CO adsorption since the electrons can be pulled from the surface more easily. Those electrons interact with the corresponding σ and π orbitals of the CO molecule. According to Table 3, the FeCo(100) surface is more reactive for CO adsorption than either the Co(0001) or Fe(001) surface due in part to its lower work function. Moreover, the FeCo(100)–Fe surface tends to be more reactive for CO adsorption than the FeCo(100)–Co surface. Since this work is purely based on thermodynamic equilibrium, that is, the stable adsorption configuration of CO, studies related to the dissociation and subsequent C–C coupling or C–H bonding pathways are required to determine the turnover frequency of the catalyst. The surface needs to bind strong enough for stretching the C–O bond, but not too strong that it inhibits further C reactivity for the crucial next steps of the FT process.

Also, the work function is not the only property that determines the effect of alloying towards the mechanism of CO adsorption. Since the FeCo(100) surface is more reactive than the pure metal surface, the CO adsorption energies of the FeCo(100) surface fall between the range of CO adsorption energies of the pure Fe(001) and Co(0001) surfaces. It is also found that CO binds stronger on the FeCo(100)–Co surface even though it tends to be less reactive according to the lower work function. The next section discusses the d-band center, which is another property of the metal that is related to the adsorption energy and corresponding mechanism of the CO-adsorbed system.

### 3.3.2. The metal’s d-band center (ε_d)

Nørskov and co-workers previously showed that the adsorption energy consists of two elements, that is, the coupling to the s states of the transition metal and the extra coupling to the d states [44–50]. However, the first contribution from the s state is relatively similar for each transition metal. Consequently, only the coupling to the d electrons of the transition metals is taken into account for considering the trend in adsorption energy and the reactivity of the surfaces [44,49,50]. The location of the d-band center (ε_d) relative to the Fermi level can be used to describe the bonding strength between the adsorbate and the metal surface. As the d-band center moves closer to the Fermi level, the bond between the adsorbate and the metal surface becomes stronger since the antibonding states exist above the Fermi level and these states are empty. The opposite trend is observed when the d-band center is shifted down (further from the Fermi level) and the antibonding states become filled so that the bond between the metal surface and the adsorbate is weaker [44].

The d-band center is the centroid of the d-orbital density of states and it is calculated by taking the first moment of the projected density of states up to the Fermi level [51]. Table 4 lists the d-band center for the surface metal atom and the example of CO adsorption at the top site of each surface is considered. The location of the d-band center of the FeCo(100)–Co surface is closer to the Fermi level when compared to the d-band center of the FeCo(100)–Fe surface; hence, a stronger CO adsorption energy on the FeCo(100)–Co surface is observed. Comparing the location of the d-band center of the FeCo(100)–Fe surface with the d-band center of the pure Fe(001) surface, according to Table 4, it is found that the d-band center of the FeCo(100)–Fe surface is located further away from the Fermi level than the d-band center of the pure Fe(001) surface. Therefore, the weaker adsorption energy is obtained in case of CO adsorption on the FeCo(100)–Fe surface. This observation indicates that the effect of alloying towards the change in electronic structure of the alloy surface from the pure metal surface and its ultimate consequence on the adsorption energy of CO.

### 3.4. Other CO adsorption configurations on the FeCo(100) surface

It has been known that CO typically binds in the upright position with the C-end down toward the top site of several transition metals surfaces [35]. Typically, the CO adsorption energy is rather similar at top and bridge sites and slightly less stable at hollow sites [38]. Interestingly, recent theoretical studies [52–54] reveal the unique CO geometry after adsorption on the (100) surfaces of body-centered cubic transition metals and alloys. It has been shown that the adsorption of CO on the bcc(100) metal surface differs from that of fcc metals and even bcc(110) surfaces. The most stable site for molecular CO adsorption is the fourfold hollow site with tilting angles with respect to the surface normal in the range of 47°–58° depending on the type of metal. The carbon atom is in the fourfold hollow site, whereas the oxygen atom is at the bridge position. Only at monolayer coverage does co-adsorption in a perpendicular mode occur [51]. In addition, the tilted geometry is observed only when CO binds to the high coordination adsorption sites, i.e., bridge and hollow sites, with oxygen taking part directly in the bonding mechanism with the metal. Additional calculations where the CO molecule was placed at the hollow site with an initial tilting angle of approximately 45° from the surface normal were performed at 0.25 ML coverage and the results are shown in Table 5. It is important to note that CO adsorption at the hollow-Fe site with tilted geometry is more stable than adsorption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>ε_d (eV)</th>
<th>Adsorption energy (eV) on top location at 0.25 ML</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FeCo(100)–Co</td>
<td>−1.74</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeCo(100)–Fe</td>
<td>−2.26</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(001)</td>
<td>−0.92</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co(0001)</td>
<td>−1.17**</td>
<td>1.16††</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ref. [65], ** Ref. [66]. † Ref. [34], †† Ref. [35].
at the hollow-Co site with a tilting angle and even stronger than the adsorption on the top-Co site. Considering the C–O bond distance after adsorption, the CO molecule is activated in all possible adsorption modes as noticed from an increase in the CO bond distance compared to its bond distance in the gas phase.

4. Conclusions

The adsorption mechanism and electronic structure of CO adsorption on FeCo(100) alloys have been investigated using spin-polarized DFT calculations. It has been found that the FeCo(100)–Fe surface is more stable than the FeCo(100)–Co surface. However, it is important to keep in mind that these surface energies were calculated at the zero-temperature and zero-pressure environment. To take into account the realistic environment for Fischer–Tropsch synthesis, one can include the \textit{ab initio} thermodynamic concept for the surface energy calculation [63] where the stability of the surface as well as the surface composition can be determined at the finite temperature and pressure. The appropriate thermodynamic potential to consider is the Gibbs free energy. The Gibbs free energy of the entire system can be divided into contributions from the bulk solid phase, the gas phase and the surface. The Gibbs free energy for the gas species that is in direct contact with the surface of study is equivalent to the chemical potential of each species (i.e., CO, H₂ and hydrocarbon gases for the Fischer–Tropsch environment). As a result, the surface energy with respect to an equilibrium with the environment can be determined by Eq. (3),

\[
\gamma = \frac{1}{A} \left[ G_{\text{sys}}(T,p,N_{\text{M}},N_{\text{H}}) - N_{\text{M}} \mu_{\text{M}}(T,p) - \sum \nu \mu_{\text{H}}(T,p) \right].
\] (3)

According to the adsorption energy of the corresponding systems, CO preferentially adsorbs on the Co-site rather than the Fe-site. This finding is opposite that of CO adsorption on the pure surface, in which Fe exhibits a stronger adsorption energy. The top sites appear to be the most stable for CO adsorption at both 0.25 ML and 0.50 ML coverages. All of these adsorption configurations appear to be CO activation sites; however, when the CO molecule was placed at the hollow site at a tilting angle, the adsorption energy was found to be strongest. Analysis of the LDOS of the surface atoms and the charge density profiles shows that the bond-breaking of the CO molecule results in a lone-electron orbital at the O atom and the radical-state C atom. The latter can form a bond with the metals on the surface. This finding is qualitatively in reasonable agreement with the Nilsson-Pettersson model. Alloying Fe and Co together does not affect the mechanism of CO adsorption on the surface; nevertheless, the electronic properties of the alloy are different from the pure metal surface. The work function of the FeCo(100) alloy is smaller than the value of the pure Fe or Co surface. It could be implied that the FeCo(100) surface becomes more reactive. Another important electronic property that defines the surface adsorption preference is the d-band center of the surface metal. It was found that the d-band center of the FeCo(100)–Fe surface is closer to the Fermi level compared to the d-band center of the pure Fe(001) surface and the stronger adsorption of CO on the FeCo(100)–Fe surface is evident. It is important to note that alloying Fe and Co together can significantly change the adsorption strength of CO as observed from the switch of the preferable adsorption surface. In future work, DFT + U as well as the inclusion of the RPA calculations as the post-correction to the preceding DFT calculation will be investigated for the correction of the adsorption energy especially in case of adsorption at the hollow site.

It is worth keeping in mind that this study focused strictly on the CO adsorption mechanism, which is the very first step of the CO activation during the FT process. The CO molecule should not bind too strong to the surface so that it cannot dissociate and form new bonds with carbon or hydrogen. This work represents an example of how the properties of a metal might be tuned for optimal CO-surface reactivity via alloying. So far, the FeCo alloys have been studied without support or promoter effects. In reality, catalyst surfaces can restructure upon deposition onto a support, which likely influences the reactivity of particular reaction. For example, the addition of aluminum oxide with certain pretreatment conditions, in which AlₓOᵧ-supported Fe(110) was exposed to an oxidizing environment, can restructure the initially inactive AlₓOᵧ/Fe(110) catalyst and enhance the ammonia synthesis reactivity by approximately a 400-fold increase compared with clean the Fe(110) surface [64]. Future work will involve the investigation of support/promoter effects on catalyst reactivity.
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